

1 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
2 THOMAS R. BURKE (State Bar No. 141930)
3 thomasburke@dwt.com
4 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 800
5 San Francisco, CA 94111-6533
6 Telephone: (415) 276-6500
7 Fax: (415) 276-6599

8 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
9 DAN LAIDMAN (State Bar No. 274482)
10 danlaidman@dwt.com
11 DIANA PALACIOS (State Bar No. 290923)
12 dianapalacios@dwt.com
13 865 South Figueroa Street, 24th Floor
14 Los Angeles, California 90017-2566
15 Telephone: (213) 633-6800
16 Fax: (213) 633-6899

17 Attorneys for Defendant
18 Joseph Teixeira

19
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
21
22 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

23
24
25
26
27
28
15 CITY OF INGLEWOOD, a public entity,) Case No. 2:15-cv-01815-MWF-MRW
16 vs.) Plaintiff,) Assigned to the Hon. Michael Fitzgerald
17))
18 JOSEPH TEIXEIRA and Does 1-10,))
19) Defendants.))
20))
21))
22))
23))
24))
25))
26))
27))
28))
15 [Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss
16 (Rule 12(b)(6)); Notice of Motion and
17 Motion to Strike (Rule 12(f));
18 Declaration Of Joseph Teixeira With
19 Exhibit B; Declaration Of Dan Laidman;
20 Notice of Lodging of DVDs With
21 Exhibits A, C-F; Notice Of Manual
22 Filing; and [Proposed] Orders Filed
23 Concurrently]
24) Action Filed: March 12, 2015
25)
26)
27)
28)

Pursuant to Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, Defendant Joseph Teixeira respectfully requests that this Court take judicial notice of the following materials attached as Exhibits A through F to the concurrently-filed Notice of Lodging of DVDs and Declaration of Joseph Teixeira submitted in support of Mr. Teixeira's (1) Motion To Dismiss pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(b)(6); and (2) Motion To Strike pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 12(f):

1. Exhibit A: The contents of the six YouTube videos referenced and linked at Paragraph 19 of the Complaint that form the basis for the City's claim. See Teixeira Decl. ¶ 3; Notice of Lodging of DVDs, Ex. A.
2. Exhibit B: The contents of the screenshots of the six YouTube pages referenced and linked at Paragraph 19 of the Complaint that form the basis for the City's claim. See Teixeira Decl. ¶ 4, Ex. B.
3. Exhibit C: The content of the City of Inglewood's video recording of the July 20, 2010 Inglewood City Council meeting, which is referenced at Paragraph 19 of the Complaint and forms the basis for the City's claim. See Teixeira Decl. ¶ 5; Notice of Lodging of DVDs, Ex. C.
4. Exhibit D: The content of the City of Inglewood's video recording of the May 22, 2012 Inglewood City Council meeting, which is referenced at Paragraph 19 of the Complaint and forms the basis for the City's claim. See Teixeira Decl. ¶ 6; Notice of Lodging of DVDs, Ex. D.
5. Exhibit E: The content of the City of Inglewood's video recording of the February 11, 2014 Inglewood City Council meeting, which is referenced at Paragraph 19 of the Complaint and forms the basis for the City's claim. See Teixeira Decl. ¶ 7; Notice of Lodging of DVDs, Ex. E.
6. Exhibit F: The content of the City of Inglewood's video recording of the April 23, 2013 Inglewood City Council meeting, which is referenced at Paragraph 19 of the Complaint and forms the basis for the City's claim. See Declaration of Dan Laidman ¶ 2; Notice of Lodging of DVDs, Ex. F.

1 A court may consider the content of materials referred to in the complaint that
 2 form the basis of the plaintiff's claims, even if the plaintiff neglects to attach the
 3 materials to the complaint. See Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd., 551
 4 U.S. 308, 322 (2007) (court deciding Rule 12 motion may consider "documents
 5 incorporated into the complaint by reference"); Knievel v. ESPN, 393 F.3d 1068,
 6 1076-77 (9th Cir. 2005) (Rule 12 motion properly granted by considering web pages
 7 referred to in complaint and attached to defendant's motion). As one court explained
 8 in applying incorporation-by-reference in an analogous copyright case, the "doctrine
 9 provides that if a plaintiff mentions a document in his complaint, the defendant may
 10 then submit the document to the court without converting defendant's 12(b)(6)
 11 motion to a motion for summary judgment. The doctrine prevents a plaintiff from
 12 evading dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6) simply by failing to attach to his complaint a
 13 document that proves his claim has no merit." Brownmark Films, LLC v. Comedy
 14 Partners, 682 F.3d 687, 690 (7th Cir. 2012) (quotation and alterations omitted).¹

15 Such materials may be introduced through a request for judicial notice
 16 pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201. For example, in Campbell v. Walt Disney
 17 Co., 718 F. Supp. 2d 1108 (N.D. Cal. 2010), the court granted the defendant's motion
 18 to dismiss a copyright claim, holding that the defendant's motion picture, "Cars,"
 19 was not substantially similar to the plaintiff's screenplay. Id. at 1116. To reach this
 20 conclusion, the court took judicial notice of the contents of the film and the
 21 screenplay, which were referenced in, but not attached to, the complaint. Id. at 1111
 22 n.3. Similarly, in granting a motion to dismiss in Felix the Cat Prods, Inc. v. New
 23 Line Cinema, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21763; 54 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1856 (C.D. Cal.
 24 April 28, 2000), the court took judicial notice of the content of the motion picture

25
 26

¹ See also Klang v. Pflueger, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145779, at *2 (C.D. Cal.
 27 July 10, 2014) ("[t]he Court also may take judicial notice of documents attached to or
 28 necessarily relied upon by the complaint.") (citing New.Net., Inc. v. Lavasoft, 356 F.
 Supp. 2d. 1090, 1115-16 (C.D. Cal. 2004)).

1 “Pleasantville,” noting that “the Picture is an authentic document whose content is
 2 integral to plaintiff’s claims but is not attached to the complaint.” Id. at *6. And in
 3 Sobhani v. @radical.media, Inc., 257 F. Supp. 2d 1234 (C.D. Cal. 2003), the court
 4 took judicial notice of the content of the motion picture “Cast Away” where it was
 5 the subject of the plaintiff’s copyright claim. Id. at 1236 n.1.²

6 As in these cases, here the City bases its copyright claim on videos that it
 7 necessarily refers to in the Complaint, but does not physically attach. See Cmplt. ¶¶
 8 2, 14, 19, Cmplt. Ex. A. Specifically, it alleges that Mr. Teixeira infringed its
 9 purported copyrights in the City Council meeting videos included in Exhibits C-F by
 10 creating the videos included in Exhibit A and posting them to the YouTube pages
 11 included in Exhibit B. Id. ¶ 19. Because the content of these videos and web pages
 12 are referenced in the Complaint and the City necessarily relies on them as the basis
 13 for its claim, these materials are incorporated by reference in the Complaint and are
 14 proper subjects of judicial notice. E.g., Campbell, 718 F. Supp. 2d at 1111 n.3;
 15 Sobhani, 257 F. Supp. 2d at 1236 n.1; Felix, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21763, at *6.

16 Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, Mr. Teixeira respectfully requests
 17 that this Court take judicial notice of Exhibits A-G.

18 DATED: April 16, 2015

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
 THOMAS R. BURKE
 DAN LAIDMAN
 DIANA PALACIOS

21 By: /s/ Dan Laidman

22 Dan Laidman

23 Attorneys for Defendant
 24 Joseph Teixeira

25
 26 ² See also Burnett v. Twentieth Century Fox, 491 F. Supp. 2d 962, 966 (2007)
 27 (considering content of TV show that formed basis of copyright claim but was not
 28 attached to complaint); Daly v. Viacom, Inc., 238 F. Supp. 2d 1118, 1121-1122
 (N.D. Cal. 2002) (considering video referenced in, but not attached to, complaint);
Zella v. E.W. Scripps, 529 F. Supp. 2d 1124, 1139 (C.D. Cal. 2007) (same).